MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Industrial Areas Development Bill, 1966, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

SRI S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Gift Goods (Unlawful Possession) (Amendment) Bill, 1966, be taken into consideration."

MR. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Gift Goods (Unlawful Possession) (Amendment) Bill, 1966, be taken into consideration."

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, this is an amendment to the Act of 1963. This has been brought in order to give enhanced punishment to those who possess the food articles gifted by certain organisations. In the 1963 Act, all the food articles gifted were not enumerated. Now the step has been taken to enumerate all these articles. All articles gifted to any State Government or to the Central Government or to any other person or organisation in its individual capacity or on behalf of the State Government are brought under the purview of the Act so that the Government can take possession of the articles which are being possessed unlawfully by individuals. In the matter of hearing cases, it has been provided that precedence should be given to the hearing of these cases, because these are important cases. Provision has been made for delivery of such confiscated articles to the authorities of the State Government. retaining samples for trial or enquiry in the Court, to avoid deterioration. This has been brought in order to see that the entire articles, if they are left in the Court will get deteriorated and lost. So, in order to see that these articles are made use of by the State officers, only samples are kept in the Court and the articles are taken away with the permission of the Court.

Sir, this is a very simple Bill and I commend it to the acceptance of the House.

†SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, this is an amending Bill which incorporates some very insalutory principles, because, if we see clause 3 it seems very strange that such a provision has been drafted by the Government. It says :

> "*3. Penalty for unlawful possession of Gift Goods.*—Whoever is found or is proved to have been in possession of any quantity of gift goods shall, unless he proves that the gift goods came into his possession lawfully, be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years or with fine or with both."

This presumption, I think, is against the very fundamental penal law.

(SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI)

The previous section was in conformity with the penal law. It says :

> "If any person is found, or is proved to have been, in possesion of any gift goods reasonably suspected of being stolen or unlawfully obtained, and cannot account satisfactorily how he came by the same, he shall, on conviction, be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both."

But, in the present amending bill, the mere fact that he has been in possession is taken to be that he is guilty, because it is not a marketable commodity. The prosecution must be before the Court.

MR. SPEAKER.—Here is something which a man should not possess. If he possesses such articles, should he not be punished ?

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—I request my hon'ble friend to read clause 3B. Clause 3 has reference to clause 3B. It says :—

> "Any goods specified in Schedule I contained in any receptacle, package or covering on which such marks (including words and figures) as the State Government may from time to time by notification in the official Gazette specify,..."

MR. SPEAKER.—They are intended to be used by particular person for particular purpose.

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—Any article is not brought into operation. It is only those articles which bear marks that are brought into operation.

SRI ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—The whole Penal law is being reversed and the burden of proof is being shifted to the accused and it is going to affect the very fundamental of Penal law. Under the previous clause, the scope for suspicion would arise when gift goods are suspected of being stolen reasonably or unlawfully obtained and the prosecution must prove it. But here if the case goes to the Court the whole burden of proof is placed on the accused and he must prove that he has come across that article lawfully. It is a very unwholesome provision under the Penal law.

MR. SPEAKER.—How does the Member think that the man comes into possession of such articles ?

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—That has to be proved by the prosecution itself. For the mere fact that he has in his possession, should he be condemned ? It is very wrong. I cannot concur with you in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER.—Not with me; I have no opinion. I am trying to understand things.

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Supposing a teacher, who is not entrusted with the task of distribution, possesses such goods with the

permission of another teacher, who is entrusted with that duty. If anybody wants, he could be brought before the Court. There, he has to prove that with the permission of a certain person, he possessed the goods. This means putting the cart before the house. It is not correct at all. You cannot deprive the fundamental rights of a person that he is presumed to be guilty. If you go through Schedule 1, all these things are sold in the market; all the articles mentioned here, are sold in the market.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What happens if a person is in possession of counterfeit currency? The principles of jurisprudence should be the same.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—At least, the initial burden of proof lies on the prosecution. Here, they say, the mere possession is enough. It is not enough that he possesses it, but they must also prove that he is in illegal possession of it. Who is the authority who should possess it?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The State Government, the Central Government, the person on behalf of either of these in respect of goods gifted it depends upon the nature of goods.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Any person who comes into possession of these goods knowingly, he is guilty. But, how can the purchaser know that it is gifted goods? The seller may know it. So, if the seller and the purchaser are placed on the same footing, I think, it is going against any principle of any law. This should not be done.

In clause 6, it is said that precedence should be given by the Magistrate for the trial of these cases. Sir, there may be murder cases or dacoity case is pending before the Magistrate. So, I do not understand why precedence should be given to these cases over such serious cases. Then, about disposal of these goods. If they are perishable goods, the Magistrate has got ample powers to deliver the goods after taking some security. Instead, if the Magistrate is given this direction that he must return the sample and hand over the whole thing to the party, it is not necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—These articles should not go into the market again. That is why it is said that it should be handed over to the office.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—After satisfying himself that the goods belong to him, he can take security and hand over. It must be given to the proper person and not the accused.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Proper person is the officer.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Yes. When the property is being handed over to the proper person, the proper person will be the authority who claims it.

The proposed new section 5B provides for confiscation of animals, vehicles, etc. I do not koow why this poor animal should be confiscated. If the owner is prosecuted then that is a different thing. I have come across cases where these animals are kept without water and fodder for days.

(SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI)

5-30 P.M.

If an offence is committed without the knowledge of the owner, then I do not think he must be penalised for it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Did the member read the proviso?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Here the burden of proof has been placed upon him. That should not be the case. Unless he has initentionally done it, the owner hould no be penalised. Although the law provides for some drast action on the part of the Government, we should not reversethe trendin the principles of penal law and we should not place the burden of proof on the accused and then tell him that he must prove his innocence. Therefore, I think these provisions need modifications.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಬಹಳ ಸಣ್ಣದಾದರೂ ಬಹಳ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಉಂಟು ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ತಂದಿರುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶ, ಏನೋ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ನಡೆದಿದೆ, ದಾನ ಧರ್ಮ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ನಿಯಾಗಿ ಏನಿಯೋಗ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕೈಯ್ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶಕ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ತಂದು ಬಡ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಿಮಗೆ ತೋರಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. Gifed goods, ಯಾರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಂದು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ? ವಿದ್ಯಾಖಾತೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಕೈಕೆಳಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಕೂರ್ ಮೇಷ್ಟ್ರುಗಳು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೊಡೆಲಿಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಟ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಂಫ್ಯೋರ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ನಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಆದಮೇಲೆ, 1963ರಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನು ತಂದರು. ಈಗ 1966 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದು ಉಗ್ರಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ವಿಧಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅನುಭವ ಏನು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿ? ಪೆಡ್ಯೂರ್ ಮುತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಶ್ರೀ ಅಣ್ಣಾರಾಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ವಿದ್ಯಾಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾದ ಏವಾದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ಕೂರ್ ಮೇಷ್ಟ್ರುಗಳು ಸ್ಕೂರಿನಿಂದ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶಾಲಾಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳು ಬಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಲಿ ಬೀಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ವಿದ್ಯಾಖಾತೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಕೈಕೆಳಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಕೂರ್ ಮೇಷ್ಟ್ರು ತಂದು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಟರ್ ಚೀಸ್ ಡಬ್ಬ ಒಡೆದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಡಬ್ಬಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಪಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಗಿಫ್ಟ್ ಆಗಿ ಬಂದ ಇಂತಹ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ವಾಸನೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೆ? ಗಿಫ್ಟೆಡ್ ಗೂಡ್ಸನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ ಕ್ಷಣಕ್ಕೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಪರವಾಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಮದ್ಯಪಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮನುಷ್ಯನನ್ನು ಮೂಸಿ ನೋಡಿ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಅತ ಮದ್ಯಪಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಗಿಫ್ಟೆಡ್ ಗೂಡ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದ ಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? Muckannappa is in possession of cornmeal ಎಂದು ಪೋಲೀಸಿನ ವರಿಗೆ ದೂರು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೋರ್ಟು ಮುಂದೆ ನಾನು ಅಪರಾಧಿ ಆಗುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆಗ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮುಂದೆ ಎವಿಡೆನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಸೀರ್ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ಯಾಕೇಟ್ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. The court will come to a decision that the property does not belong to the complainant. To whom should it go? should it go to the complainant or accused? What happens to this property? ನನಗೆ ಇರುವ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಭವದೊಳಗೆ ಹೇಳುವು

ದಾದರೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಟ್ರಿಸ್ಪ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ, ಪ್ಯಾಕೇಟ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಸೀರ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ತಿಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವನು ಅಪರಾಧಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಸೀರ್ ಟ್ಯಾಂಪರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೇರೆ ಟಿನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ? ಕಾಂಟ್ರಾ ಬ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಗೋರ್ಡ್ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಮೆರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಅದು ಕಾಂಟ್ರಾ ಬ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಗೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಕ್ಸೈಜ್ ಡ್ಯೂಟಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ? ಈ ಗಿಫ್ಟೆಡ್ ಗೂಡ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ರೂಪು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಬೇರೆ ರೇಖೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. Unless it is actually found with all the packages and seals, it is not possible to prove it. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಬಹಳ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ತಾವು ಶ್ರೀ ಅಣ್ಣಾರಾಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕೇಸುಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಿಸೀಡೆನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಮರ್ಡರ್ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಕಮಿಟರ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನೂರಾರು ಜನ ಅಪರಾಧಿಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. 20 ಪೌಂಡು ಹಾಲು ಅಥವಾ ಕಾರ್ಡಮಾಲ್ ಕದ್ದು ಅತನನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟು ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದರೆ ಆ ಕೇಸಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಯಾರಿಟಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಿಯಾರಿಟಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಆದೇಶ ಕೊಡುವಷ್ಟು ದೂರ ಹೋದರೆ, ಅದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರಾಡಿಸ್ಪೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಮುಂಚೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಯಾವುದು ಪೆರಿಷಬಲ ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ಸ್ ಎಂಬುದು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹಾಲಿನ ಪುಡಿ ಕದ್ದವರನ್ನು ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು ಆ ಕಡೆ ಈ ಕಡೆ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಕಂಠಿ.—ಅದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆ ಇದೆ. ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಹಾಲಿನ ಪುಡಿ ಕದ್ದವನಿಗೆ, ಮುಸುಕಿನ ಜೋಳ ಕದ್ದವನಿಗೆ, ತುಪ್ಪ ಚೀಸ್ ಕದ್ದವನಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲು ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಖೂನಿ ಮಾಡಿದವನಿಗೆ ಆಮೇಲೆ ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಈಗ, ಇಷ್ಟು ಸಣ್ಣ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಲು ಕದ್ದದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು 3 (ಎ) ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆಬ್ಜೆಕ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ರೀಸನ್ಸ್ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಕಠಿಣತರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗಾದರೂ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಜಲ್ಮಾನೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ಬಡ ಸ್ಕೂಲ್ ಮಾಸ್ಟರರಿಗೆ ಏಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೀರಿ ? ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾರಣ ಉಡುಪಿ ಹೋಟಲಿನವರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ (ಕಾಪು).—ನ್ಯಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊಚೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಉಡುಪಿ ಹೊಟೇಲಿನವರು ಎಂದರೆ, ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಹೋಟೆಲಿನವರು ಎಂದು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ಇಲೆಕ್ಷನಿಗೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರಿಂದ ಹಣ ಕೇಳಿ ವಸೂಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is Absolutely beside the point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಮೊನ್ನೆ 500 ಪೌಂಡ್ ಹಾಲಿನ ಪುಡಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟರು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಅವರು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಹೋಟೆಲಿನವರೆಂದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಎಡೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ವಶೀಲುಬಾಜಿಗೆ ಈಡ್ಡ ಆಗಬೇಡಿ. ಬೇರೆ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಣ್ಣತನವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳು ಮಾಡಿ 300 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಜುಲ್ಮಾನೆ ಹಾಕಿ. ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನೋ ಅನಾಹುತ ನಡೆದೀತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I am grateful to the two Hon'ble friends who have taken part in the debate but I am sorry that both of them are on the wrong path. The presumption is not in respect of any goods but it is only in respect of certain goods specified in Schedule I contained in any receptacle, package or covering on which such marks as the State Government may from time to time by notification in the Official Gazette

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

specify. These are cases where precedence has to be given because the articles are perishable, and soon after that these goods will be returned to the officers who will dispose of them for the purposes for which they are meant.

The Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa made much about the disposal of the gift foods. According to the Ho'ble Member, there is enough provision in the Criminal Procedure Code. According to the Criminal Procedure Code, the goods cannot be handed over to any person except to the person from whom they have been attached. Therefore, this provision has been made. These goods which are of a specific character have to be handed over to the officers of the Government who will dispose of them for the purpose for which they are meant.

In the case of confiscation of animals and vehicles, there is a proviso and it is a sufficient guarantee that there will not be misuse of his power. What the Hon'ble Members have said is due to a misconception of the whole structure of the Bill. With these words I commend this Bill for the acceptance of the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"that the Mysore Gift Goods (Unlawful Possession) (Amendment) Bill, 1966 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

CLAUSES 2 to 10.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clauses 2 to 10 both inclusive stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 10 both inclusive were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 1, ETC.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

SRI S. R. KANTHI —Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Gift Goods (Unlawful Possession) (Amenment) Bill, 1966 be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Gift Goods (Unlwful Possession) (Amendment) Bill, 1966 be passed."

The motion was adopted.

ANDHRA PRADESH AND MYSORE (TRANSFER OF TERRITORY) BILL, 1966

Motion to consider.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Andhra Pradesh and Mysore (Transfer of Territory) Bill, 1966, as referred to by the President under Article 3 of the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Andhra Pradesh and Mysore (Transfer of Territory) Bill, 1966, as referred to by the President under Article 3 of the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration."

†Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—Sir, this is in respect of a very small piece of land measuring about 5 acres and 3 guntas surrounded by the territories of Andhra. It consists of only one Survey number. When the Provinces and States Absorption of Enclaves Order, 1950 was passed, this enclave seems to have been lost sight of. This was discovered later on and it would be in consonance with the spirit of the Provinces and States Absorption of Enclaves Order, 1950, less if this enclave is transferred to Andhra State. This matter was brought before the Southern Zonal Council held in Bangalore on the 24th September 1961 and it was decided in that Council that this bit of land may be transferred to Andhra Pradesh. Both from the point of view of administrative convenience and also from the practical point of view it is necessary that this bit of land should be handed over to Andhra Pradesh. Hence this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a preliminary step for ascertaining the views and having regard to the small extent of area and admitted circumstances, there cannot be any difference of opinion with regard to this Bill. The views of this House are in full concurrence with the provisions that are found there.

The motion was adopted.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That this House having considered the Andhra Pradesh and Mysore (Transfer of Territory) Bill, 1966, as referred to by the President under Article 3 of the Constitution of India, approves the same."